Surcharge on Land Revenue.

*Q.—284. Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI (Afzalpur).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

whether the Chief Minister has expressed his willingness to levy a hundred per cent surcharge or cess on land revenue to supplement the State's resources while discussing the State's proposals for the annual plan of 1966-67 with the Planning Commission ?

*A.—Sri M. V. KRISHNAPPA (Minister for Revenne).—

Yes.

Construction of a Tourist Centre.

*Q.—326. Sri KUNDUR RUDRAPPA (Channagiri).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether they intend to construct a tourist centre at Shantisagar tank site in Channagiri Taluk ;

(*b*) whether they have not received any representations from the public to take the work early ?

*A.—Sri D. DEVARAJ URS (Minister for Transport and Tourism).—

(*a*) The matter is under consideration of the Government.

(*b*) Representations have been received.

NOTICE OF ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

(*Disallowance*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, six Hon. Members have given notice of ar Adjournment Motion. Matter called by the motion is relating to foo position, famine condition and all that. I am disallowing it.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—Will you kindly read the motion ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would not. I will do what is necessary and I will take the House into my confidence and say why it is disallowed. It is addressed as an Adjournment Motion so that the work of the House may be adjourned or suspended to deal with this matter. Adjournment Motions have got peculiar character and tests to be satisfied and a number of rulings and directions make it not possible to allow. The grounds of disallowance of adjournment motions are 38, but I am not going into all of them. But I will state a few : (1) it does not relate

V-31 N66
1966-2,1-3,5,6
(B) 4833

to a matter of recent occurrence which has arisen suddenly but it relates to a continuing matter; (2) it relates to a matter which is likely to be debated in the near future or discussion which has already been fixed; (3) it seeks to revive a discussion on the matter which has been discussed during the current session; (4) the matter sought to be raised is covered by amendments to Motion of Thanks on Governor's Address.

Now, if I read a few amendments to the Motion of Thanks, it will be perfectly clear that this indentical matter has been taken up earlier. I would even read out the names of the Hon'ble Members who gave notice of those amendments. The amendment of Sri B. P. Kadam at page 131 of the printed proceedings which have already been distributed to members reads:

> "the Address makes on adequate mention of the deteriorating food problem in the State and Government's inability to handle it";

Sri Krishna Shetty's amendment:

> "the Address makes no mention of the deteriorating food situation in the State and the Government's inablity to handle it";

Sri H. R. Keshava Murthy's amendment:

> "the Address fails to mention the steps taken by the Government to handle the food situation and for providing food to the starving masses without any means, in the scarcity hit rural area.";

Sri Venkatagiriyappa's amendment:

> "Government have failed to supply adequate foodstuffs to the famine stricken population in rural areas and small towns and it has failed to provide employment to rural labourers".

Sri V. S. Patil's amendments (*d*) and (*e*):

> "(*d*) Government have failed in their duty to supply sufficient food to the people of the State;
>
> "(*e*) Government have failed in not taking proper steps in purchasing food-grains from big land-holders";

Sri S. Gopala Gowda's amendments (*a*) and (*e*)

> "(*a*) to consider the State as one Unit and taking upon themselves the responsibility of procurement, storage and distribution of foodgrain";
>
> "(*e*) to amend the Levy Order in view of the loss of crops due to failure of monsoon rains and to solve the famine condition in the State, to introduce the rationing throughout the State".

(MR. SPEAKER)

I have marked even the speeches of the members who have dealt with it and it is in the same session we are trying to have this motion now.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Sir, the point is this. Certain assurances were given to this House when the debate took place last time—about a month back. The present adjournment motion confines itself to the inadequate measures taken by the State Government to meet the famine conditions in the State. So, it is not as if it is a continuing factor.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If steps are not taken, matters continue.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Certain assurances were given that they would do everything to meet the situation however grave it is. But during the last 15 or 20 days, no such adequate steps have been taken to meet the situation. The Assembly is in session and the State is looking to this House and the steps we are going to take. So, is it not open for us to move the adjournment motion so that we may discuss the situation confronting the State ? It is in this line I request the Chair to look at the question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, I am very much impressed with the importance of the matter, namely, that food situation is one about which the entire State and every citizen is concerned with. I would not like to shut out if I can. But, two things are in the way ; one is the rule which says, if we have discussed the matter, we should not discuss it by way of adjournment motion. If the Rule stands in the way, I am anxious to help how this matter can be brought up because everybody is anxious. After all, it is a very important matter. Therefore, I am trying to find out a way.

So far as Adjournment Motion is concerned, if it is to be disallowed because it has already been discussed by way of amendment, I do not know how it could be allowed. If it is possible, I would like that it should be taken up in some other shape, not as an Adjournment Motion because the rules do not permit me. It is not my sweet discretion. Then, the question is, in two days we are having the Budget and the whole thing comes up for discussion. I do not think the scope of the discussion is in any way less important. I can understand the view point that along with other matters it can be discussed. In the Budget discussion, the convention is that the members can choose any subject like, food, agriculture, etc., and then have a full Debate. Therefore, I am convinced morally that the members will have ample chances in view of the peculiar circumstances, *viz.*, Budget Session. Still I am anxious to do something. I want to see whether we cannot persuade the Government to take the House into confidence with regard to the food situation because there are criticisms. Is it not better for the Government to make a statement when the House is in Session ? Will Sri Sivappa not think so.